

JOURNAL

OF THE

ASIATIC SOCIETY.

*Points in the History of the Greek, and Indo-Scythian Kings in Bactria, Cabul, and India, as illustrated by decyphering the ancient legends on their coins. By CHRISTIAN LASSEN, Bonn, 1838.*¹

We now proceed to apply the fourteen letters, thus defined, to the attributive epithets, met with on the legends. From this examination we shall derive some new letters, with which the names of the kings could not furnish us, and we may perhaps succeed by this in obtaining a more exact insight into the character of the language. But let us first sum up the results of the previous inquiry.

The fourteen characters, above discussed, appear to me to be sufficiently confirmed (to aid us) in further decyphering. Twelve among them are consonants, which, however, do not enable us yet to define the system of consonants in the language. We therefore resort to the vowels. We have discovered the two simple vowels *a* and *ee*: the first, when initial in a syllable, is expressed by an independent symbol, placed in the line itself; when following a consonant, it is not expressed by an independent sign, but included in the consonant. There is no peculiar sign for the long *a*. The independent figure of *e* is not yet known to us; preceded by a consonant, it is denoted by a mark on the consonant, and it has likewise no peculiar sign, when long. It serves to express the

¹ Continued from p. 276. vol. ix.

Greek vowels ε , η , ι , υ , while α is substituted for a and o . We are also acquainted with an \hat{o} , the long sound of the Sanscrit, compounded of a and u , which, however, when it concludes a word, loses so much of its value as to correspond with even an omicron. It is always expressed by an independent symbol in the line. We have supposed by anticipation, $e\bar{e}$ to be of a similar nature with o ; but that ai and au exist uncontracted, is to be doubted.

With regard to the language, as we know as yet too little of it, it will be best to put together our results at the end of the next paragraph. But for the system of vowels I think it most convenient to insert here a short disquisition.

ε , o , υ , not existing in the language, and the simple vowels, being restricted to a and e , it may be inferred, that the language upon the coins, as regards the system of its vowels, continued to exist (from of old) in the same undisturbed and simple state. Of simple vowels, we have to expect only an oo , and it seems even probable, that, when preceded by consonants, it was written in a similar way as e .

Mr Grotefend, by reading *Ukratidó*, imagined that he had discovered the initial oo in the name Eukratides; we may subsequently dispute this view. To find the u , preceded by a consonant, we must here discuss the name, Philoxenos.

In this name the second syllable is not \neg , as it represents λo in Apollodotos; but in As. Trans. vol. iv. pl. xxi. No. 1. and No. 2. there occurs on both occasions one and the same symbol between *shinó* and the beginning of the word which has a η . It is but half preserved upon No. 1.; upon No. 2., however, where we do not find any appearance of decay, a \dagger occurs; thus we may fairly suppose, that \neg belongs at this place only to l , and \neg may be the symbol for u . R. R. II. No. 5 also is unfortunately much spoiled; yet, it is evident, that there was only one symbol between *shinó* and the beginning of the word, which can only be a well preserved η ; on the other hand, in No. 6. between *shinó*, and the beginning of the word, we observe the following, IH, so that we should be inclined to suppose H to be substituted for \neg , viz. for λo , and I to be K. This Mr. Grotefend has adopted. But as I shall assign to K an entirely different figure, which

cannot have occurred before \varnothing , either upon this coin, or upon the others of Philoxenos, I must maintain, that the native orthography had no K at all in the name. But supposing, the line l belonged to the preceding H, and that there must have been a α there, which in this form cannot be H, I can only admit, that the cross line was half corroded, while both final lines were too much protracted; in a word, that we must recognize here, Mr. Prinsep's figure, α .

The assertion, that the second symbol in the name of Philoxenos,* which I restore thus, $\text{P}\text{L}\varnothing\alpha\text{P}$ is *lu*, is at variance, however, with the more common mode of representing the omicron by an inherent A. We think this objection so important, that we shall adopt α for *lu* at first only in the way of conjecture. It is countenanced only by the name Agathokles, written in the old Sanscrit character, which is rendered *Agathukla*, and consequently the authority exists in at most only a contiguous language. With more confidence we maintain, that the natives did not retain the k in the name of Philoxenos, and in that case an absorption of k with the sibilant must have taken place. There is, however, no analogy with this absorption in the Prâcrit; here x (क्ष) is altered into kkh (क्ख); the language of the coins does not always follow the rules of absorption in Prâcrit, this is proved by *hirmajô*; it does not abound, as the Prâcrit, with reduplicated consonants; this is proved by Apollodotos, which is expressed *Apaladatô*. We must therefore look out for other analogies, and here the Zend supplies us with the very striking fact, that it often substitutes sh for क्ष (ksh) of the Sanscrit. Thus *dashina* (the right) for *daksina*, *ashi* (eye) for *akshi*. I therefore conclude ∇ to be sh (sch).

But why should this sh occur in Lysias, which has but the s in Greek? I shall be perhaps reminded, in answer, of the Sanscrit rule which might have been originally observed in the Zend, according to which s, preceded by any other vowel than a,

* Mr. James Prinsep's last reading of this peculiar name from the Bactrian legend was as follows, $\text{P}\text{L}\text{P}\text{L}\alpha\text{P}$ *Phila-senasa* or *Philasinasa*. See page 652, vol. vii. July, 1838. It is this name and that of Lysias that proved the ρ to be an S .---H. T. P.

§ 3.

ԲԱՊԲԴՆՍ ԲՅԴԿԴԲՅԴՆՍ.†

‡ As Trans. v. p. 549.

PAO upon the Kanerkes-coins, and he was in consequence compelled to admit some spurious forms of *n*, resembling the shape of *r* and *t*; his alphabet exhibits five of them. Mr. Prinsep supposed them to be repetitions of the word *Malakáo*. Both of them, I think, will admit the refutation on previous grounds. By the term *Mahárágô* the simple title, βασιλεὺς, is always expressed, and it is remarkable enough, that the simple word *rágan* never occurs for it. The Greeks were satisfied with the plain title βασιλεὺς; this term Menandros and the Greek Kings ordinarily make use of: Eukratides alone affects the prouder title ΒΑΣΙΛΕΩΣ ΜΕΓΑΛΟΥ, for which *Mahá-rágô* appears to be the adequate translation. It certainly may be so according to original meaning, but scarcely according to the real interpretation of the word; for *Mahárágô* was already so much worn out by use, that it was of no more value than the simple king. Many an insignificant chieftain thus styles himself in Indian inscriptions; and the degradation of the term has so increased, that many private men at present claim this title, as for instance Rammohun Roy, who was so called, and a *Mahárága* is as common in India, as a *principe** in Italy. Eukratides (whether *the second*, or not, shall here be left undiscussed) was certainly aware of the difference in the acceptation of those words, if he have also titled himself, according to the drawing of Masson (and not according to the represented coins†) upon some specimens 𐎧𐎡𐎴𐎡𐎴𐎧𐎡𐎴𐎡𐎴 , “the great king, the king of kings.” As then *Mahárágô* was of less value, than it was as originally compounded, the explicit addition of the term “*great*” to Azes after the words, “*King of Kings*” is less tautological, than it appears at the first glance.

The compound word *rágárágô* corresponds to βασιλέως βασιλέων. These words (*máhárágô rágárágô*) may both be Sanscrit as well as Prâcrit; for as used here, the Sanscrit would

* As. Trans. iv. p. 338.

† If the definition of an Italian *principe*, “something less than an English Esquire,” is correct, Mr. Lassen is certainly out in his estimate of the common usage, to which *maharaja* is put. It is only in Bengal and Behar, that the title may be termed degraded to the use of private men. 卐

change the nominative as into ô. The variety *râgâdirâgô* contains a remarkable mistake in orthography, the word *adhirâga* "Supreme King,* often met with in the titles of Indian Kings, has dh, not d. Whether the stamp-cutters in Azes' time, perhaps not often natives, did not pay much attention to the proprieties of indigenous grammar, or whether the language itself confounded both sounds, d and dh, I shall not pretend to decide; there will hereafter indeed occur some other examples of the same substitution.

Mahatô (great) compels us to declare the language of the coins a variety of Prâcrit. The Sanscrit nominative is *mahan*, the Prâcrit nominative *mahantô*; the terminal ô at this place proves also, that the alteration of as into ô occurred in all instances, as in Prâcrit. The writing *mahatô*, by exhibiting the same omission of n, as occurred in *Atimakho* for Antimachos, proves, that it is not the pure Indian Prâcrit, but a dialect, approaching also to the old Persian; for when the arrow-headed inscriptions render *gadârâ*, hidhush† for *gandârâ*, hindush, there is the same exsection of n, when followed by dentals, or properly an absorption, when n is rendered like the succeeding letter; thus the Byzantines said *Kaddakootzen*, instead of *Kantakootzen*. The language of the coins, however, like the Zend, has no reduplicated consonants, consequently not *mahattô*.

The constant epithet *ἀνίκητος*, is very distinct upon the Philoxenos coin (As. Trans. Vol. iv. Pl. xxi. No. 1.) *𐎱𐎠𐎼𐎿𐎡𐎹*,‡ *Apalihatô*. *Apratihata* signifies in Sanscrit *non repulsus*; the preposition *prati* often becomes in Prâcrit *pali*.§ We have consequently got another Prâcrit form of quite unexceptionable interpretation. *Νικηφόρος* and *νικάτωρ* are expressed by the same word. See the coins of Amyntas (As. Trans. Vol. v.

* *Atirâg'a*, being not in use for this title, I shall leave it undiscussed, if there it must not be read *𐎡𐎹* ti.

† According to Mr. Beer's correction; I have much pleasure in availing myself of this opportunity to thank him publicly for his solid and instructive, as well as kind, critique of my work on arrow-headed writing.

‡ Mr. James Prinsep reads this epithet *Apavihatasa* 𐎱𐎠𐎼𐎿𐎡𐎹, and this *Jayadharasa*.

§ My Grammar, iv. 5. 0.

Pl. XLVI. No. 1) and those of Archelios, at the same place (Pl. XXXV. No. 1). Farther evidence is superfluous. It is represented in the native language by 𐎧𐎧𐎧𐎧 . The letter, yet unknown, can be only *v*, and the word *gájavató* (the victorious,) according to the same form as *maható* for the Prâcrit *gajavantó*, Sanscrit *gajavan*, in the accusative, *gajavantam*.

We have therefore acquired *v*, 𐎧 . (as our 15th letter.)

The word, substituted for *δικαιος*, commences with a symbol yet unknown (As. Trans. iv. Pl. XXI. No. 9. v. pl. XXXV. No. 6. No. 1.)* The second syllable is every where ω , *mi*; after it follows a yet undefined letter, and then *ô*.

The first has the form ϵ or 𐎧 upon the two coins, first mentioned; upon the last coin the same sign, but reversed, so as almost to resemble 𐎧 ; and it is probably only incorrectly drawn, though Mr. Prinsep from the Archelios coin and from one coin of Azes, who likewise assumed this title (As. Trans. iv. Pl. XXIII. No. 22. v. p. 549.) has chosen this figure for the print.† It will be safer at all events to take the other.

As I think, I have proved, that we have to look for Indian words upon the coins, it evidently follows from the second syllable that 𐎧𐎧𐎧𐎧 must be read, *dhāmiko* (the just); in Prâcrit *dhāmmikó* or *dhāmikó*, in Sanscrit *dharmikas*. The *â* is here again unwritten, and the consonant is not reduplicated according to the already stated peculiarity of the language of the coin; the union in one character of *r m* accords quite with the rule of Prâcrit, while the retention of the *r* in *Hirmajó*, is certainly to be accounted for (as before noted) by the authority of the king Hermaios, who would not allow his name to be corrupted. What I have further to prove, are the two new letters; on *k*, I shall speak hereafter; I will now discuss our 16th letter ϵ or 𐎧 , *dh*.

It appeared already from former remarks, that the second *n* is not met with in the name Menandros. Now we know,

* R. R. II. No. 9. is indistinct.

† The Azes-coin, however, according to the representation, is not well preserved, or not precisely copied by Mr. Masson, for the last letter also is wrong: 𐎧 for 𐎧 .

that the native language did not admit an n, followed by dentals. Mr. Prinsep read *Minanó*, as the penultimate symbol is indeed very similar to the n, already discussed. It is thus upon the coin (As. Trans. v. Pl. XLVI. No. 6,) where no error appears to have occurred $\text{P}\xi\xi\omega$, and I should not hesitate to read *Minanó*, were it not evident, that by the law of the language the n cannot be retained in Menandros, and were not the omission of dr at variance with the rules of the absorption of consonants.

Mr. Grotefend's supposition, as it appears from his Hebrew paraphrase $\text{מננ} [\text{דרע}]$ is deficient, in that the termination ô, which he improperly puts also between brackets, occurs often enough to prove, that nothing is omitted before it. I do not therefore know, how he can read Menandrô; for the coins he used, have no more symbols than the others.

It is only fair, however, to add, that the letters of the coins (R. R. I. No. 8, 9, 11) have become so indistinct, that, with regard to the name, nothing can be decided from them. No. 10 renders, in apparently well preserved characters, $\text{P}\text{r}\omega$, which we might read *Mitaró* or *Mitadó*, but the P upon the coin is certainly spoiled. Not to judge too arbitrarily, I shall leave it to a renewed investigation, if there occur two orthographies of that name.

By comparing the remaining copies we observe, R. R. II. No. 12. has still the n, though mutilated, then $\cdot\xi$, and lastly P. Even upon Tod's coin, No. 2, quoted by Mr. Grotefend, the terminal letters are also obviously $\text{P}\xi$; the preceding letter is entirely misdrawn. As. Trans. Pl. XXVI. No. 2. distinctly renders L in the form, above established, and the final letters are again $\text{P}\xi$. Consequently $\text{P}\xi\omega$; No. 3 is no less distinct; the $\cdot\xi$ has an additional point, as at R. R. II. No. 12, As. Trans. v. pl. XLVI. No. 8 has $\text{P}\cdot\xi\omega$, with two points. At the same place, No. 1 gives $\cdot\xi$ with the point, but afterwards an n of the same form, but without the point. Thus also v. pl. XLVI. No. 6. $\text{P}\xi\xi\omega$.* Finally at the same place No. 9 and No. 5 have for these two ξ , two I viz. $\text{P}\text{I}\omega$, save only, that No. 5 is more indistinct and corroded.

* Mr. James Prinsep has two readings for the Bactrian legend of Menander-coins, viz. $\text{P}\xi\xi\omega$ Menanasa and $\text{P}\xi\text{I}\omega$ Medanasa.---H. T. P.

Here we therefore indeed observe an inconsistency in the characters, which depends not simply upon the state of the coins, while from the addition of variously situated points with both letters, we may presume, that the indistinctness was to be amended by additional diacritical symbols. This idea as to the points, cannot be established but by carefully examining the coins themselves. The point at ॡ serves perhaps to distinguish it from ॠ, ॡ.

Be it as it may, it is evident from our review, that some coins obviously distinguish the second symbol from the third. As now ॠ by the omission of the cross line below, and by a greater curvature in the middle, may easily be altered in the figure ॡ, nothing prevents us from supposing, that the second syllable may still be ॠ or *na*.

The penultimate symbol, being proved so incontrovertibly as n, ॡ, I do not hesitate to declare it the above adopted dh ॡ. In the word *dhāmikó* we observed also instances, showing that ॡ has a straight form ॠ, and this approaches so much to n, that we can hence likewise account for the confounding of both.

For ॠ we never meet with a peculiar symbol, and the name must therefore be read *Minadô*. The adoption of ॡ as dh, will lastly be confirmed by the fact, that in the same word it is commonly written ॠ, and seldom ॡ. The ॠ upon the coin, R. R. I. No. 10, appears to be indeed confounded in the reversed way, viz. ॠ for ॡ. But ॡ if it be a dental sound, *dhāmikó* decides for the adoption of *dh*.

In *Minadhó* r is absorbed, according to rules of Prâcrit, for instance, *kandras* becomes *kando*. As ॡ for d appears to be the rule in Menandros, we cannot consider ॡ to be substituted by mere chance for ॠ; but it must be founded upon the nature of the language. We may here recall to mind the rule of the Zend, according to which the Sanscrit *putra* is changed into *puṭhra*. The omission of the r may have had an effect, similar with the Persian *sur*, (*si*, or *three*) which presupposes a previous form *thi*, the *th* of which still remained, after r had disappeared out of the more ancient form *thri* in Zend for the Sanscrit *tri*.

We have in *Minadhó* for Menandros an evident instance,

that the language of the coins followed its own principles, in the paraphrase of Greek names. I would notice at the same time, that we may expect a similar kind of absorption in Eukratides, and we can already hypothetically maintain, that *r*, preceded by consonants, was absorbed.

R before consonants is likewise absorbed, as in *dhámikó*, and we undoubtedly have properly attributed to foreign authority the deviation from the rule in *Hirmajó*. If the name Archelios were precisely represented in the native writing, it would supply us another opportunity for testing the rule for *r*. The name of this king is certainly written thus, and not *Archelaos*, if the Greek be properly represented, and the native legend, according to the only copy, *As. Trans. v. pl. xxxv. No. 1*, be properly rendered by Mr. Masson. The Greek legend is distinct: ΒΑΣΙΛΕΩΣ [ΔΙΚΑ]ΙΟΥ ΝΙΚΗΦΟΡΟΥ ΑΡΧΕΛΙΟΥ; the native legend is similar, save the name, which is in the copy entirely illegible. Mr. Prinsep, however, renders this also, according to Mr. Masson's drawing. I copy the whole: *ᲠἈᲗᲚᲗ ᲠᲚᲗᲗᲗ ᲠᲗᲗᲗᲗ ᲠᲗᲗᲗᲗ*.

Leaving the name for the present, we may assert, on the authority of the other examples, that the initial of the second word is incorrectly given, it must be *ε*. The legend will consequently be *Mahárágô dhamikô gajavatô*, the supreme King, the just, the victorious.

In the name itself *Თ* is evidently an error for *Თ*, *li*, as *Lishijó* for *Lysias*; for *rehe* there consequently was only one symbol. If Mr. Masson has correctly copied, it is there *Ahalijó*. But as *ε* (epsilon) must be expressed by *e*, it follows, that the second letter has not been completely preserved, and I do not doubt, that it was *χ*, *chi*, *khi*. But there is no trace whatever of *r*, and we have again an absorption of *r* before other consonants. If Archelios was termed in the native language *Akilijó*, his pride was perhaps gratified, as being reminded of the name of the great Pelide, so that he would not much object to the rule.

The most difficult title, that namely, by which *σωτήρ* is

translated, is still left to be discussed. It too terminates in ô ; but there precede three symbols, which belong all to t, d, r, letters so easily to be confounded, though Mr. Prinsep,* who, however, observes the ambiguity, has taken it for k. Among all the readings, *rakakô*, *radakô* *radadô*, which can be taken on his conjecture, he chooses *rakakô*, because the Sanscrit word *rakshaka* denotes *protector*, and because (he does indeed not expressly mention this, but it must have influenced his decision) its form in Prâcrit is *rakkhakô*. Though I could mention several other objections to this interpretation, suffice it to say, that there is no k to be met with in the word. For the same reason we cannot adopt the word *târaka*, supporter, deliverer.

Mr. Grotefend started on the supposition, that it was the same with KOPANO, which occurs upon the Kanerkes-coins. Besides, however, that this word may have belonged to a dialect, different from what we have hitherto discussed, the same objection will also be decisive; neither the n, here assumed, nor the k can stand the test.

After having compared all instances of this word upon the coins of Menandros, Apollodotos, Diomedes, Hermaios, it remains doubtful yet, as for what we can take the three first characters of the word; we may read 𐎠𐎡𐎢 just so, according to the coin which we choose as a criterion for those three letters.

A hint appears in the following. We observe different orthography of this word upon coins, which certainly belong to a later period, and the words on which seem to intimate an altered state of the language, as upon the coins As. Trans. Vol. IV. Pl. XXIII. No. 23, where the Greek legend exhibits ΒΑΣΙΛΕΥΣ ΒΑΣΙΛΕΩΝ ΣΩΤΗΡ ΜΕΓΑΣ, so also upon the coins of the unknown king, who usually has only Greek inscriptions;† fortunately we can easily read a portion of the native legend, it is thus: 𐎠𐎡𐎢𐎣𐎤𐎥𐎦𐎧, therefore, *mahatô* — *adharô mahârâgô*; to this there probably succeeded *râgarâgô*; but this part is no longer legible. ε is the second character in

* IV. 335.

† The king too is on horseback, as upon the purely Greek coins of the great deliverer; this accords with the monogram. See at the same place No. 26. The reverse is different.

the word we are in search of; it will therefore be in the usual form a 𑀓 or d. Now the word is thus written upon the Yndopherres-coins 𑀧𑀲𑀸𑀓, dh standing here too for the first letter.

Before recognising these representatives of the first two signs* of 𑀧𑀲𑀸𑀓, I had asked myself, by what word *σωτήρ* would be expressed in Sanscrit? The question was easily answered; it could only be *trātri*, nominative *trātā*, accusative *trātāram*; the nominative in Prâcrit is *tādārō* for this;† thus 𑀧𑀲𑀸𑀓 was without difficulty to be read. The reading, discovered afterwards, 𑀧𑀲𑀸𑀓 confirmed this interpretation. For want of a more exact knowledge, 𑀸, dh, was substituted for d. 𑀸 in the first syllable shows a state of pronunciation, still more corrupted, but otherwise it is an acceptable confirmation, by establishing the dental sound of the beginning.

In the Prâcrit of the dramas, the initial t usually retains its class (as a letter) while the t, included by other letters, is generally subdued (as a sound) to d, I find in 𑀧𑀲𑀸𑀓 this transition of t to d; without asserting, however, that this form of the d had been adopted upon the older coins. He that still adheres to the reading of *tātārō*, can only be opposed by reasons, not to be derived from the characters. The form 𑀧𑀲𑀸𑀓 which reduces the initial also to dh, refers to a still later period of the language.

I think, I have sufficiently explained the usual epithets and titles, and I may now be allowed to survey the principal results.

The language has apparently manifested a strong bent to the Prâcrit of the dramas, by its absorptions and by forming new, short forms of A from the long ones; the nominatives in ô, as belonging also to Zend, prove nothing (as regards Prâcrit affinity) words as *rāgan* and *dharmo* are so undoubtedly Indian, and not Zendic, that the relation of the language to India is quite evident from them; also *gaja* for victory, and *tādārō* for deliverer (though I shall not deny, that the latter belongs to the Zend) are entirely Indian roots.

* Mr. James Prinsep's last reading of this word was 𑀧𑀲𑀸𑀓 *Nandatasa*.---
H. T. P.

† My Grammar, p. 291.

But we should be wrong in not confessing, that some traces referred to a dialect, not merely Indian, as, for instance, the omission of *n* before *t* and *d*, and the want of reduplicated consonants, even when they were required for the foreign word, as Apollodotos. The latter fact does not accord with the Prâcrit, where nothing is more frequent than *ll*, *mm*, and others. The former, though not Zendic, is old Persian, and the language of the coins seems to occupy a place midway between the old Persian and the Indian languages.

It is now incumbent on me to vindicate the opinion I have adopted regarding *k*, in opposition to both my predecessors, in effecting which I shall discuss the names of Greek Kings, not yet examined, which will prove instrumental in fixing the alphabet.

§ 4.

*Inquiry into the Alphabet from the names of Greek Kings.
Continued.*

Mr. Prinsep as well as Mr. Grotefend, obtain their *k* principally from the name Eukratides; the latter represents it in the form \neg ; according to the former, it does not differ from *d* and *r*. The name Eukratides induces the following dilemma,—whether we suppose the diphthong $\varepsilon \upsilon$ to be expressed by one or two letters, both succeeding letters are displaced. No one has supposed the case, that *r* was perhaps omitted, though it is evident, that according as it is expressed or not expressed, *k* must occupy another place. Mr. Grotefend read *Ukratidô*, Mr. Prinsep *Eukratidô*.

To arrive at the real *k*, we shall pursue a different course.

The *k* I adopted in *dhâmikô*, is exactly \neg upon the coin of Archelios; upon another at the same place, v. Pl. xxxv. No. 6, \neg is substituted for it, so that the right half of the letter does not occur; upon the copy iv. Pl. xxi. No. 9, the symbol is destroyed, also in R. R. II. No. 9. But that \neg is the real, complete figure, follows from a remark of Mr. Prinsep* who notices, that upon a coin of Azes (iv. Pl. xxiii. No. 22,) \neg distinctly is the penultimate symbol of the word, denoting *just*.

* V. p. 549.

the drawings of Mr. Masson represent this wise the name 𐎧𐎠𐎡𐎢𐎣 . But as the k in this very name Eukratides, was entirely misunderstood formerly, I may be allowed to proceed a little more cautiously. I shall therefore place the different characters, yet preserved, of four edited coins, one under the other As. J. Vol. iv Pl. xxv. No. 8 has 𐎧𐎠𐎡𐎢𐎣

	”	”	”	”	9	”	𐎧𐎠𐎡𐎢𐎣
	”	”	”	”	10	”	𐎧𐎠𐎡𐎢𐎣
R. R. I.	”	”	”	”	7	”	𐎧𐎠𐎡𐎢𐎣

The last half consequently is *tidó*, three characters only precede it. The third among them is decidedly not r. Two legends exhibit the k, already known to us, one gives the k (𐎧 for 𐎡), and a fourth decides nothing, as the legend is evidently spoiled. R is therefore omitted, as in *Minadó* for Menandros.

If therefore*—*katidó* is to be read, Mr. Prinsep is quite right in stating, that two symbols precede k, but I do not know in this case, how he obtains his r. Mr. Grotefend proceeded carefully by adopting one character only for ϵv in order to get k r. He must therefore take k for r, the 𐎧 for k, and 𐎡 for a simple vowel, while the initial letter, according to him, represents u. Thus is it in his alphabet, but I hope, I have convinced him of his mistake.

In interpreting the two first characters, I shall not begin by inquiring, in what manner the diphthong ϵv , foreign to those languages, might have been expressed; as to its being foreign, I think, it is already inferentially proved in the previous remarks. As v is rendered by i, I shall adopt 𐎧 or 𐎡 as i, viz. as the sign of this vowel, when commencing a syllable. Though this is not here the case, yet there was no other expedient in the system of

* Mr. James Prinsep's last reading of this name was as follows :---

Eukratidasa 𐎧𐎠𐎡𐎢𐎣 viz.

𐎡 e
 𐎧 u
 𐎡 kr
 𐎡 ti
 𐎧 d
 𐎡 s

Eukratidasa, See Journal for July, 1838,---H. T. P.

the native language, unless the writing *Ejakatidó* were chosen ; but it was more natural to write *eikatidó*. By this paraphrase I acknowledge, that with Mr. Prinsep, I take ॠ for ê, viz. for a long ê, which was not confined to denoting the never shortened vowel of the Sanscrit, but which also expressed the lighter one of the Prâcrit, and which, as the analogous ô, ॡ, probably had its constant place in the same line with the consonants. The reason, that e in *ēikatidó* is not, as usual, expressed by i, appears even to have proceeded from the impossibility of approaching the foreign sound in any other way, than in that, above mentioned.

With regard to the last two of our three new letters, we shall call to mind, that they still have to be confirmed (17,) ॢ, k (18) ; ॣ, i ; (19,) ।, ê.

Again k seems to occur in a name, hitherto obscure, and which even now cannot be entirely illustrated.

The Agathokleia-coin offers the unexpected and pleasing fact of a Greek queen in that remote quarter of the East ;* upon its one side we observe a helmeted head, whether of a woman we shall leave undecided, with the legend ; ΒΑΣΙΛΙΣΣΑΣ ΘΕΟΠΡΟΠΟ(Υ)ΑΓΑΘΟΚΛΕΙΑΣ. If we now look upon the reverse for an interpretation of the unusual and obscure epithet of the queen, we find the representation of a sitting Hercules, who appears with the left hand to hold the lion's skin, and with the right perhaps leans on a rock, as upon the coins of Euthydemus, where, however, he holds with the left the club. While in expectation of the translation of the Greek legend, we are surprized at the word ;† ΠΑΓΓ(Υ) *mahá-rágó*. We know the language sufficiently to assert, that it, like the Prâcrit, has not used the masculine termination for a queen. There is therefore the title of a king. Then follows ΠΑΓΓ(Υ) *tádáró*, deliverer. Two testimonial instances prove, that

* As. Trans. V. Pl. XLVI. No. 2.

† *Maharajasa* according to Mr. James Prinsep, who particularly remarks, that the masculine word is used. The word after *Maharaja* he suggests may preferably be read *Devamatasa*, which is an exact translation of ΘΕΟΤΡΟΠΟΥ,--H. T. P.

the Greek titles are not repeated on the reverse, and we therefore cannot derive any advantage from discussing them here.

After *mahārāgō tāddrō* we expect the name of a king, which must be contained in the symbols $\text{P}\gamma\epsilon\text{P}\eta\omega$.*

The writing does not compel us to divide the word in two, as Mr. Prinsep proposed, because P is placed in the middle.

The second letter, if properly drawn, can only be k, and there is no room for doubt on this point, as the coin itself was in the hands of Mr. Prinsep. The fourth character, though most closely approaching the form of dh, may likewise be taken for an n; it is accompanied by ee. Mr. Prinsep indeed substitutes for this the figure γ in his print, but on the coin it is such as I represent it.

The† initials being therefore *Mikó*, may correspond with the Greek Μικω , Μεκω , Μηκω , Μυκω . It appears probable, that the next letter of a Greek word is rather n than dh, which would be only substituted for d. We lastly meet with P and the unlucky letter γ , which may be taken for t, d, or r, and affords a beautiful opportunity for a guess.

Since Μεκ is not the beginning of any Greek word, and no king is likely styled Μηκωνίτης , the initial letters must certainly be Μικω or Μυκω ; we cannot say much in favour of Μικ , even if we would look for an absorbed r in the native character, viz. Μικρω .

We therefore come to Μυκω , and here Μυκόνιος , from the island Mycone, appears of itself; Μυκωνίδης is indeed not a Greek name, otherwise known, though it would be least objectionable to read in this way the native characters. If γ were allowed instead of η , we should obtain *Myronides*, who would be admitted with much less opposition as a king, not yet known at the Indus. But not indulging such a supposition, merely arbitrary, we do best to wait for further discoveries.

* Mr. James Prinsep reads $\text{P}\gamma\epsilon\text{P}\eta\phi$ the name here referred to Fakasaglitasa.---H. T. P.

† Mr. James Prinsep's discovery of the letter ϕ , as equivalent to the Greek ϕ , resolves the difficulty, felt by Mr. Lassen, at finding, what he read as ω me at the beginning of the name of Agathoeleia. In this word it is apparently the equivalent of the Greek digamma.---H. T. P.

As the native name does not recall elements of Persian or Indian words, we shall by no means attempt to obtrude a barbarian husband on the noble Agathokleia.

§ 5.

Continuation—regarding the names of Kings, not Greeks.

I now pass to the coins of Kings, not Greeks, to complete the native alphabet, and to advance our knowledge of the language from their legends.

Azilises presents a new symbol. As. T. iv. pl. xxiii. No. 27. No. 28. R. R. II. No. 20. Υ , almost like an \hat{e} ; the Greek denotes the same by an s . We have already another s , ∇ , which we take for sh , and will discover a third Υ . We must therefore choose z or s for either of them. Besides, it is possible, that s in Azilises is substituted in the Greek translation for a k' (tsch) Υ , as this sound was not original in the Greek, and was adopted as $\tau\zeta$ at a later period only. It is therefore a mere arbitrary reading, when I take conjecturally for our 20th letter Υ , as z .

The Parthian king Vonones, has the Greek legend, ΒΑΣΙΛΕΩΣ ΒΑΣΙΛΕΩΝ ΜΕΓΑΛΟΥ ΟΝΟΝΟΥ.* This follows from the coins R. R. II. No. 10, No. 11, I. No. 20, where, according to the native legend, however, not ΜΕΓΑΛΟΥ, but ΔΙΚΑΙΟΥ must have been written; for we observe upon the reverse still $\Psi\eta\psi\epsilon$, as also in As. J. IV. pl. xxi. No. 5. Though we do not know yet any copy, exhibiting the entire title, we can confidently construe it by comparison. The reverses also give us nothing but fragments of the native legends; we must, however, have recourse to them to obtain the name. R. R. II. No. 10 has Δ over the right arm of Jupiter, and the letter, next following, seems to be a disfigured Ψ ; it then would be $g\acute{o}$ the end of *Mahárágó*; for the succeeding illegible word has five characters, and is therefore $\Psi\chi\gamma\chi\gamma$ *rágárágó*. It would be indeed singular, had *great* preceded the other titles. But it appears

* The Arsakides-coins also combine both titles, as those that are attributed to the twelfth (of those kings) or Phraates III, Eckhel III, 528. ΒΑΣΙΛΕΩΣ ΒΑΣΙΛΕΩΝ ΑΡΣΑΚΟΥ ΜΕΓΑΛΟΥ ΔΙΚΑΙΟΥ ΘΕΟΥ ΕΥΠΑΤΟΡΟΣ ΦΙΛΕΛΛΗΝΟΣ.

difficult to decide any thing by the instrumentality of specimens, so defective. The specimen R. R. II. No. 11, commences regularly with *māhārāgō rāgārāgō ma(hato)*. The name does not occur on either side R. R. I. No. 20, when *māhārāgō* is scarcely to be distinguished, but evidently has over the head of Minerva 𐎧𐎡𐎴 (ε,) *dhāmikō*; then follows the name,* As. T. IV. pl. XXI No. 5 has 𐎧(𐎡𐎴)𐎠(𐎧)𐎡 , probably (*māhārāgō rāgārā*)*gō*

* The same also upon a coin of Mr. Masson, As. T. III. pl. XI. No. 43,

1 𐎧 𐎡 𐎴 𐎡

2 𐎧 𐎠 𐎴 𐎡

3 𐎧 𐎡 𐎴 𐎡

are read by Mr. James Prinsep, *Spalaha'rasa*, *Spalafarmasa* and *Spalirishasa*, and with reference to this part of Mr. Lassen's treatise, it may be as well to give from a letter of Mr. Lassen's to that gentleman, dated 30th December 1838, and which reached India after Mr. James Prinsep had left, never to return, the following extract, showing the opinion of Mr. Lassen, after reading the article referred to---"You will soon receive a little treatise of mine in which I have endeavoured to show amongst other things, relating to the Bactrian or Indo-Scythian part of Indian history, that the alphabet of the Bactrian-coins was only in use in Kabulistan and the Punjab, and ought therefore to be called Caboolan; my book is unfortunately written in German---I say unfortunately, because I should wish to hear your opinion on this and other views of mine. Will not M. Csoma Dekoros do me the favor to be my interpreter? Your additional corrections of the alphabet are very valuable, particularly the 𐎧 as s. So also your *Jayadharasa*. I suspect, that Nikatoros will turn out to be Jayavatasa, the translations being so literal, and we ought to expect two terms i. e. 𐎡 as different from 𐎡 and in my opinion 𐎡 . I have in my late reading attended much to the use of the different compounds of *pata*, and am persuaded, that only *apratihata* would be used for unconquered; *Apatihata* is in fact the very Prakrit form. For shortness sake, let me only state as a conjecture, that 𐎠𐎡𐎴𐎡𐎴 is *tādārasa* from 𐎠𐎡𐎴 on the coins of Andapherres. *Tādārasa* or *dādārasa* the ε being 𐎡 also in Minadasa. Not to be forgotten, is your *Spalahara*, a capital reading that destroys with one blow, all our lucubrations on the data of VONONES. It is evident, there was a Kabulian dynasty of *Arsacidae*, coeval with that of Azas. I only propose to read 𐎡 differently, as it cannot well be a compound of s and 𐎧 . May it not be a modification of 𐎡 , corresponding with the Zend 𐎡 , which takes the place of 𐎡 in Sanscrit? Spal-yrius by the Indians was called Svalyrius, which the Greek alphabet expressed by 𐎠𐎡 . The Kabulians who called the river 𐎠𐎡𐎴𐎡𐎴 Shushva Choaspes, pronounced the king's name Shvalyrius or Galyrius."---H. T. P.

mahatô, as it will also have been upon R. R. II. No. 10; and then the name.

The state of these coins does not much invite inquiry after the name; but it being better preserved, than the rest of the words, we shall venture on the task.

As. Trans. IV. Pl. xxi. No. 5, has	𐎧𐎶𐎵𐎺𐎠
R. R. II. No. 10	𐎧𐎶𐎵𐎺𐎠
„ „ I. „ 20	𐎧𐎶𐎵𐎺𐎠

Mr. Grotefend has read it *Vonohno*; it will be observed, the two n do not correspond, nor with the more confirmed 𐎠, not to mention the illegitimate use of h, perhaps to render the syllable long. Mr. Prinsep, who always adheres to the more cautious principle of reading out of the characters, not into them, takes it for *ulalidô*, which reading, however, cannot be right.

On examining more closely, we find, that two authorities are against the initial 𐎧; as many against the second 𐎶; the three last characters are identical (in the three legends); it would be therefore 𐎧𐎶𐎵𐎺𐎠. The second has the greatest similarity to an 𐎠, and the whole exhibits *Valaharô* or *Valahadô*. This is indeed very different from *Vonones*, which must have been expressed by 𐎶𐎠𐎶𐎵𐎺, if we have arranged the letters properly, and fixed the system of this alphabet.

I am persuaded, that the name cannot be the same, and as a conjecture is here quite indispensable, I shall propose the following.

The name of a Parthian king which will be first thought of, and which occurs three or four times, is *Volagases*. Upon coins, attributed to the former, or Arsakes xxiii. is the name thus written: BOΛΑΓΑΣΟΥ. What now if this name be written on the reverse of our coins? 𐎶, h, rendered by g will not excite any doubt, if an h in the middle of a word is to be expressed by Greek characters. The termination alone does not agree, and here we may suppose, that by the sharp accentuation, the penultimate 𐎶 is changed into 𐎶. This being admitted, it would

be 𐭠𐭣𐭠𐭣𐭠𐭣, *Balahazo*, as the Indian *v* is not different in pronunciation from *b*.

This result will be surprising, and I should hesitate in communicating it, unless it appeared a very natural consequence. But how to explain the matter.

Of the Parthian language we know nothing, and he that likes, may think *Vonones* to be synonymous in the Parthian with *Valahazô*; or he may also obtain a really Indian word by writing only *Valahâsa*, viz. *he who contemns power*. I shall choose an interpretation less ingenious, but indeed based on better historical authority.

Volagases I. was the son of Vonones II. The father reigned a few months; his son, known by the wars he engaged in with Rome, is supposed to have reigned between 50 and 91 A. D.

Another Volagases is not spoken of in Parthian history as succeeding a Vonones. Have we not consequently both names upon our coins?

This conjecture appears to me so probable, that I scarcely hesitate to reject the acute one of Mr. Raoul Rochette,* who states, that it was Vonones I., the vanquisher of Artabanus; and even though Mr. K. O. Mueller takes this explanation as undoubtedly correct, the passages of Strabo, concerning the conquests of the Parthians in Bactria, mention neither of the two Vonones.

Another king, likewise not Greek, of this later period, offers another problem. Mr. Prinsep states his name to be *Ipalirisos*,† and we read indeed upon the coin *v. Pl. xxxv. No. 7*, ΒΑΣΙΛΕΩΣ ΒΑΣΙΛΕΩΝ ΜΕΓΑΛΟΥ ΙΠΑΛΙΡΙΣΟΥ; the initial *I* of the name, however, is not quite distinct. *R. R. I. No. 21*, gives nothing of the legend but ΒΑΣΙΛΕΩΝ ΒΑΣΙΛΕΩΣ, and upon the reverse three illegible characters. Owing to the accurate drawing of Mr. Prinsep, we can supersede that of Mr. Masson, *As. Trans. III. Pl. XI. No. 44*. Upon *No. 6* the name does not occur in Greek; the rest is distinct.

Mr. Prinsep has established his reading upon the comparison

* II. p. 28.

† *As. Trans. V. 551*.

of six well preserved copies, but the comparison is made by Mr. Masson, and he will excuse me in asserting, that the name of the king was not this; the native legend being preserved remarkably well, is thus upon both specimens of Mr. Prinsep: 𐎧𐎠𐎧𐎡𐎢𐎣𐎤𐎥𐎦𐎧𐎨𐎩𐎪𐎫𐎬𐎭𐎮𐎯𐎰𐎱𐎲𐎳𐎴𐎵𐎶𐎷𐎸𐎹𐎺𐎻𐎼𐎽𐎾𐎿𐏀𐏁𐏂𐏃𐏄𐏅𐏆𐏇𐏈𐏉𐏊𐏋𐏌𐏍𐏎𐏏𐏐𐏑𐏒𐏓𐏔𐏕𐏖𐏗𐏘𐏙𐏚𐏛𐏜𐏝𐏞𐏟𐏠𐏡𐏢𐏣𐏤𐏥𐏦𐏧𐏨𐏩𐏪𐏫𐏬𐏭𐏮𐏯𐏰𐏱𐏲𐏳𐏴𐏵𐏶𐏷𐏸𐏹𐏺𐏻𐏼𐏽𐏾𐏿𐐀𐐁𐐂𐐃𐐄𐐅𐐆𐐇𐐈𐐉𐐊𐐋𐐌𐐍𐐎𐐏𐐐𐐑𐐒𐐓𐐔𐐕𐐖𐐗𐐘𐐙𐐚𐐛𐐜𐐝𐐞𐐟𐐠𐐡𐐢𐐣𐐤𐐥𐐦𐐧𐐨𐐩𐐪𐐫𐐬𐐭𐐮𐐯𐐰𐐱𐐲𐐳𐐴𐐵𐐶𐐷𐐸𐐹𐐺𐐻𐐼𐐽𐐾𐐿𐑀𐑁𐑂𐑃𐑄𐑅𐑆𐑇𐑈𐑉𐑊𐑋𐑌𐑍𐑎𐑏𐑐𐑑𐑒𐑓𐑔𐑕𐑖𐑗𐑘𐑙𐑚𐑛𐑜𐑝𐑞𐑟𐑠𐑡𐑢𐑣𐑤𐑥𐑦𐑧𐑨𐑩𐑪𐑫𐑬𐑭𐑮𐑯𐑰𐑱𐑲𐑳𐑴𐑵𐑶𐑷𐑸𐑹𐑺𐑻𐑼𐑽𐑾𐑿𐒀𐒁𐒂𐒃𐒄𐒅𐒆𐒇𐒈𐒉𐒊𐒋𐒌𐒍𐒎𐒏𐒐𐒑𐒒𐒓𐒔𐒕𐒖𐒗𐒘𐒙𐒚𐒛𐒜𐒝𐒞𐒟𐒠𐒡𐒢𐒣𐒤𐒥𐒦𐒧𐒨𐒩𐒪𐒫𐒬𐒭𐒮𐒯𐒰𐒱𐒲𐒳𐒴𐒵𐒶𐒷𐒸𐒹𐒺𐒻𐒼𐒽𐒾𐒿𐓀𐓁𐓂𐓃𐓄𐓅𐓆𐓇𐓈𐓉𐓊𐓋𐓌𐓍𐓎𐓏𐓐𐓑𐓒𐓓𐓔𐓕𐓖𐓗𐓘𐓙𐓚𐓛𐓜𐓝𐓞𐓟𐓠𐓡𐓢𐓣𐓤𐓥𐓦𐓧𐓨𐓩𐓪𐓫𐓬𐓭𐓮𐓯𐓰𐓱𐓲𐓳𐓴𐓵𐓶𐓷𐓸𐓹𐓺𐓻𐓼𐓽𐓾𐓿𐔀𐔁𐔂𐔃𐔄𐔅𐔆𐔇𐔈𐔉𐔊𐔋𐔌𐔍𐔎𐔏𐔐𐔑𐔒𐔓𐔔𐔕𐔖𐔗𐔘𐔙𐔚𐔛𐔜𐔝𐔞𐔟𐔠𐔡𐔢𐔣𐔤𐔥𐔦𐔧𐔨𐔩𐔪𐔫𐔬𐔭𐔮𐔯𐔰𐔱𐔲𐔳𐔴𐔵𐔶𐔷𐔸𐔹𐔺𐔻𐔼𐔽𐔾𐔿𐕀𐕁𐕂𐕃𐕄𐕅𐕆𐕇𐕈𐕉𐕊𐕋𐕌𐕍𐕎𐕏𐕐𐕑𐕒𐕓𐕔𐕕𐕖𐕗𐕘𐕙𐕚𐕛𐕜𐕝𐕞𐕟𐕠𐕡𐕢𐕣𐕤𐕥𐕦𐕧𐕨𐕩𐕪𐕫𐕬𐕭𐕮𐕯𐕰𐕱𐕲𐕳𐕴𐕵𐕶𐕷𐕸𐕹𐕺𐕻𐕼𐕽𐕾𐕿𐖀𐖁𐖂𐖃𐖄𐖅𐖆𐖇𐖈𐖉𐖊𐖋𐖌𐖍𐖎𐖏𐖐𐖑𐖒𐖓𐖔𐖕𐖖𐖗𐖘𐖙𐖚𐖛𐖜𐖝𐖞𐖟𐖠𐖡𐖢𐖣𐖤𐖥𐖦𐖧𐖨𐖩𐖪𐖫𐖬𐖭𐖮𐖯𐖰𐖱𐖲𐖳𐖴𐖵𐖶𐖷𐖸𐖹𐖺𐖻𐖼𐖽𐖾𐖿𐗀𐗁𐗂𐗃𐗄𐗅𐗆𐗇𐗈𐗉𐗊𐗋𐗌𐗍𐗎𐗏𐗐𐗑𐗒𐗓𐗔𐗕𐗖𐗗𐗘𐗙𐗚𐗛𐗜𐗝𐗞𐗟𐗠𐗡𐗢𐗣𐗤𐗥𐗦𐗧𐗨𐗩𐗪𐗫𐗬𐗭𐗮𐗯𐗰𐗱𐗲𐗳𐗴𐗵𐗶𐗷𐗸𐗹𐗺𐗻𐗼𐗽𐗾𐗿𐘀𐘁𐘂𐘃𐘄𐘅𐘆𐘇𐘈𐘉𐘊𐘋𐘌𐘍𐘎𐘏𐘐𐘑𐘒𐘓𐘔𐘕𐘖𐘗𐘘𐘙𐘚𐘛𐘜𐘝𐘞𐘟𐘠𐘡𐘢𐘣𐘤𐘥𐘦𐘧𐘨𐘩𐘪𐘫𐘬𐘭𐘮𐘯𐘰𐘱𐘲𐘳𐘴𐘵𐘶𐘷𐘸𐘹𐘺𐘻𐘼𐘽𐘾𐘿𐙀𐙁𐙂𐙃𐙄𐙅𐙆𐙇𐙈𐙉𐙊𐙋𐙌𐙍𐙎𐙏𐙐𐙑𐙒𐙓𐙔𐙕𐙖𐙗𐙘𐙙𐙚𐙛𐙜𐙝𐙞𐙟𐙠𐙡𐙢𐙣𐙤𐙥𐙦𐙧𐙨𐙩𐙪𐙫𐙬𐙭𐙮𐙯𐙰𐙱𐙲𐙳𐙴𐙵𐙶𐙷𐙸𐙹𐙺𐙻𐙼𐙽𐙾𐙿𐚀𐚁𐚂𐚃𐚄𐚅𐚆𐚇𐚈𐚉𐚊𐚋𐚌𐚍𐚎𐚏𐚐𐚑𐚒𐚓𐚔𐚕𐚖𐚗𐚘𐚙𐚚𐚛𐚜𐚝𐚞𐚟𐚠𐚡𐚢𐚣𐚤𐚥𐚦𐚧𐚨𐚩𐚪𐚫𐚬𐚭𐚮𐚯𐚰𐚱𐚲𐚳𐚴𐚵𐚶𐚷𐚸𐚹𐚺𐚻𐚼𐚽𐚾𐚿𐛀𐛁𐛂𐛃𐛄𐛅𐛆𐛇𐛈𐛉𐛊𐛋𐛌𐛍𐛎𐛏𐛐𐛑𐛒𐛓𐛔𐛕𐛖𐛗𐛘𐛙𐛚𐛛𐛜𐛝𐛞𐛟𐛠𐛡𐛢𐛣𐛤𐛥𐛦𐛧𐛨𐛩𐛪𐛫𐛬𐛭𐛮𐛯𐛰𐛱𐛲𐛳𐛴𐛵𐛶𐛷𐛸𐛹𐛺𐛻𐛼𐛽𐛾𐛿𐜀𐜁𐜂𐜃𐜄𐜅𐜆𐜇𐜈𐜉𐜊𐜋𐜌𐜍𐜎𐜏𐜐𐜑𐜒𐜓𐜔𐜕𐜖𐜗𐜘𐜙𐜚𐜛𐜜𐜝𐜞𐜟𐜠𐜡𐜢𐜣𐜤𐜥𐜦𐜧𐜨𐜩𐜪𐜫𐜬𐜭𐜮𐜯𐜰𐜱𐜲𐜳𐜴𐜵𐜶𐜷𐜸𐜹𐜺𐜻𐜼𐜽𐜾𐜿𐝀𐝁𐝂𐝃𐝄𐝅𐝆𐝇𐝈𐝉𐝊𐝋𐝌𐝍𐝎𐝏𐝐𐝑𐝒𐝓𐝔𐝕𐝖𐝗𐝘𐝙𐝚𐝛𐝜𐝝𐝞𐝟𐝠𐝡𐝢𐝣𐝤𐝥𐝦𐝧𐝨𐝩𐝪𐝫𐝬𐝭𐝮𐝯𐝰𐝱𐝲𐝳𐝴𐝵𐝶𐝷𐝸𐝹𐝺𐝻𐝼𐝽𐝾𐝿𐞀𐞁𐞂𐞃𐞄𐞅𐞆𐞇𐞈𐞉𐞊𐞋𐞌𐞍𐞎𐞏𐞐𐞑𐞒𐞓𐞔𐞕𐞖𐞗𐞘𐞙𐞚𐞛𐞜𐞝𐞞𐞟𐞠𐞡𐞢𐞣𐞤𐞥𐞦𐞧𐞨𐞩𐞪𐞫𐞬𐞭𐞮𐞯𐞰𐞱𐞲𐞳𐞴𐞵𐞶𐞷𐞸𐞹𐞺𐞻𐞼𐞽𐞾𐞿𐟀𐟁𐟂𐟃𐟄𐟅𐟆𐟇𐟈𐟉𐟊𐟋𐟌𐟍𐟎𐟏𐟐𐟑𐟒𐟓𐟔𐟕𐟖𐟗𐟘𐟙𐟚𐟛𐟜𐟝𐟞𐟟𐟠𐟡𐟢𐟣𐟤𐟥𐟦𐟧𐟨𐟩𐟪𐟫𐟬𐟭𐟮𐟯𐟰𐟱𐟲𐟳𐟴𐟵𐟶𐟷𐟸𐟹𐟺𐟻𐟼𐟽𐟾𐟿𐠀𐠁𐠂𐠃𐠄𐠅𐠆𐠇𐠈𐠉𐠊𐠋𐠌𐠍𐠎𐠏𐠐𐠑𐠒𐠓𐠔𐠕𐠖𐠗𐠘𐠙𐠚𐠛𐠜𐠝𐠞𐠟𐠠𐠡𐠢𐠣𐠤𐠥𐠦𐠧𐠨𐠩𐠪𐠫𐠬𐠭𐠮𐠯𐠰𐠱𐠲𐠳𐠴𐠵𐠶𐠷𐠸𐠹𐠺𐠻𐠼𐠽𐠾𐠿𐡀𐡁𐡂𐡃𐡄𐡅𐡆𐡇𐡈𐡉𐡊𐡋𐡌𐡍𐡎𐡏𐡐𐡑𐡒𐡓𐡔𐡕𐡖𐡗𐡘𐡙𐡚𐡛𐡜𐡝𐡞𐡟𐡠𐡡𐡢𐡣𐡤𐡥𐡦𐡧𐡨𐡩𐡪𐡫𐡬𐡭𐡮𐡯𐡰𐡱𐡲𐡳𐡴𐡵𐡶𐡷𐡸𐡹𐡺𐡻𐡼𐡽𐡾𐡿𐢀𐢁𐢂𐢃𐢄𐢅𐢆𐢇𐢈𐢉𐢊𐢋𐢌𐢍𐢎𐢏𐢐𐢑𐢒𐢓𐢔𐢕𐢖𐢗𐢘𐢙𐢚𐢛𐢜𐢝𐢞𐢟𐢠𐢡𐢢𐢣𐢤𐢥𐢦𐢧𐢨𐢩𐢪𐢫𐢬𐢭𐢮𐢯𐢰𐢱𐢲𐢳𐢴𐢵𐢶𐢷𐢸𐢹𐢺𐢻𐢼𐢽𐢾𐢿𐣀𐣁𐣂𐣃𐣄𐣅𐣆𐣇𐣈𐣉𐣊𐣋𐣌𐣍𐣎𐣏𐣐𐣑𐣒𐣓𐣔𐣕𐣖𐣗𐣘𐣙𐣚𐣛𐣜𐣝𐣞𐣟𐣠𐣡𐣢𐣣𐣤𐣥𐣦𐣧𐣨𐣩𐣪𐣫𐣬𐣭𐣮𐣯𐣰𐣱𐣲𐣳𐣴𐣵𐣶𐣷𐣸𐣹𐣺𐣻𐣼𐣽𐣾𐣿𐤀𐤁𐤂𐤃𐤄𐤅𐤆𐤇𐤈𐤉𐤊𐤋𐤌𐤍𐤎𐤏𐤐𐤑𐤒𐤓𐤔𐤕𐤖𐤗𐤘𐤙𐤚𐤛𐤜𐤝𐤞𐤟𐤠𐤡𐤢𐤣𐤤𐤥𐤦𐤧𐤨𐤩𐤪𐤫𐤬𐤭𐤮𐤯𐤰𐤱𐤲𐤳𐤴𐤵𐤶𐤷𐤸𐤹𐤺𐤻𐤼𐤽𐤾𐤿𐥀𐥁𐥂𐥃𐥄𐥅𐥆𐥇𐥈𐥉𐥊𐥋𐥌𐥍𐥎𐥏𐥐𐥑𐥒𐥓𐥔𐥕𐥖𐥗𐥘𐥙𐥚𐥛𐥜𐥝𐥞𐥟𐥠𐥡𐥢𐥣𐥤𐥥𐥦𐥧𐥨𐥩𐥪𐥫𐥬𐥭𐥮𐥯𐥰𐥱𐥲𐥳𐥴𐥵𐥶𐥷𐥸𐥹𐥺𐥻𐥼𐥽𐥾𐥿𐦀𐦁𐦂𐦃𐦄𐦅𐦆𐦇𐦈𐦉𐦊𐦋𐦌𐦍𐦎𐦏𐦐𐦑𐦒𐦓𐦔𐦕𐦖𐦗𐦘𐦙𐦚𐦛𐦜𐦝𐦞𐦟𐦠𐦡𐦢𐦣𐦤𐦥𐦦𐦧𐦨𐦩𐦪𐦫𐦬𐦭𐦮𐦯𐦰𐦱𐦲𐦳𐦴𐦵𐦶𐦷𐦸𐦹𐦺𐦻𐦼𐦽𐦾𐦿𐧀𐧁𐧂𐧃𐧄𐧅𐧆𐧇𐧈𐧉𐧊𐧋𐧌𐧍𐧎𐧏𐧐𐧑𐧒𐧓𐧔𐧕𐧖𐧗𐧘𐧙𐧚𐧛𐧜𐧝𐧞𐧟𐧠𐧡𐧢𐧣𐧤𐧥𐧦𐧧𐧨𐧩𐧪𐧫𐧬𐧭𐧮𐧯𐧰𐧱𐧲𐧳𐧴𐧵𐧶𐧷𐧸𐧹𐧺𐧻𐧼𐧽𐧾𐧿𐨀𐨁𐨂𐨃𐨄𐨅𐨆𐨇𐨈𐨉𐨊𐨋𐨌𐨍𐨎𐨏𐨐𐨑𐨒𐨓𐨔𐨕𐨖𐨗𐨘𐨙𐨚𐨛𐨜𐨝𐨞𐨟𐨠𐨡𐨢𐨣𐨤𐨥𐨦𐨧𐨨𐨩𐨪𐨫𐨬𐨭𐨮𐨯𐨰𐨱𐨲𐨳𐨴𐨵𐨶𐨷𐨹𐨺𐨸𐨻𐨼𐨽𐨾𐨿𐩀𐩁𐩂𐩃𐩄𐩅𐩆𐩇𐩈𐩉𐩊𐩋𐩌𐩍𐩎𐩏𐩐𐩑𐩒𐩓𐩔𐩕𐩖𐩗𐩘𐩙𐩚𐩛𐩜𐩝𐩞𐩟𐩠𐩡𐩢𐩣𐩤𐩥𐩦𐩧𐩨𐩩𐩪𐩫𐩬𐩭𐩮𐩯𐩰𐩱𐩲𐩳𐩴𐩵𐩶𐩷𐩸𐩹𐩺𐩻𐩼𐩽𐩾𐩿𐪀𐪁𐪂𐪃𐪄𐪅𐪆𐪇𐪈𐪉𐪊𐪋𐪌𐪍𐪎𐪏𐪐𐪑𐪒𐪓𐪔𐪕𐪖𐪗𐪘𐪙𐪚𐪛𐪜𐪝𐪞𐪟𐪠𐪡𐪢𐪣𐪤𐪥𐪦𐪧𐪨𐪩𐪪𐪫𐪬𐪭𐪮𐪯𐪰𐪱𐪲𐪳𐪴𐪵𐪶𐪷𐪸𐪹𐪺𐪻𐪼𐪽𐪾𐪿𐫀𐫁𐫂𐫃𐫄𐫅𐫆𐫇𐫈𐫉𐫊𐫋𐫌𐫍𐫎𐫏𐫐𐫑𐫒𐫓𐫔𐫕𐫖𐫗𐫘𐫙𐫚𐫛𐫜𐫝𐫞𐫟𐫠𐫡𐫢𐫣𐫤𐫦𐫥𐫧𐫨𐫩𐫪𐫫𐫬𐫭𐫮𐫯𐫰𐫱𐫲𐫳𐫴𐫵𐫶𐫷𐫸𐫹𐫺𐫻𐫼𐫽𐫾𐫿𐬀𐬁𐬂𐬃𐬄𐬅𐬆𐬇𐬈𐬉𐬊𐬋𐬌𐬍𐬎𐬏𐬐𐬑𐬒𐬓𐬔𐬕𐬖𐬗𐬘𐬙𐬚𐬛𐬜𐬝𐬞𐬟𐬠𐬡𐬢𐬣𐬤𐬥𐬦𐬧𐬨𐬩𐬪𐬫𐬬𐬭𐬮𐬯𐬰𐬱𐬲𐬳𐬴𐬵𐬶𐬷𐬸𐬹𐬺𐬻𐬼𐬽𐬾𐬿𐭀𐭁𐭂𐭃𐭄𐭅𐭆𐭇𐭈𐭉𐭊𐭋𐭌𐭍𐭎𐭏𐭐𐭑𐭒𐭓𐭔𐭕𐭖𐭗𐭘𐭙𐭚𐭛𐭜𐭝𐭞𐭟𐭠𐭡𐭢𐭣𐭤𐭥𐭦𐭧𐭨𐭩𐭪𐭫𐭬𐭭𐭮𐭯𐭰𐭱𐭲𐭳𐭴𐭵𐭶𐭷𐭸𐭹𐭺𐭻𐭼𐭽𐭾𐭿𐮀𐮁𐮂𐮃𐮄𐮅𐮆𐮇𐮈𐮉𐮊𐮋𐮌𐮍𐮎𐮏𐮐𐮑𐮒𐮓𐮔𐮕𐮖𐮗𐮘𐮙𐮚𐮛𐮜𐮝𐮞𐮟𐮠𐮡𐮢𐮣𐮤𐮥𐮦𐮧𐮨𐮩𐮪𐮫𐮬𐮭𐮮𐮯𐮰𐮱𐮲𐮳𐮴𐮵𐮶𐮷𐮸𐮹𐮺𐮻𐮼𐮽𐮾𐮿𐯀𐯁𐯂𐯃𐯄𐯅𐯆𐯇𐯈𐯉𐯊𐯋𐯌𐯍𐯎𐯏𐯐𐯑𐯒𐯓𐯔𐯕𐯖𐯗𐯘𐯙𐯚𐯛𐯜𐯝𐯞𐯟𐯠𐯡𐯢𐯣𐯤𐯥𐯦𐯧𐯨𐯩𐯪𐯫𐯬𐯭𐯮𐯯𐯰𐯱𐯲𐯳𐯴𐯵𐯶𐯷𐯸𐯹𐯺𐯻𐯼𐯽𐯾𐯿𐰀𐰁𐰂𐰃𐰄𐰅𐰆𐰇𐰈𐰉𐰊𐰋𐰌𐰍𐰎𐰏𐰐𐰑𐰒𐰓𐰔𐰕𐰖𐰗𐰘𐰙𐰚𐰛𐰜𐰝𐰞𐰟𐰠𐰡𐰢𐰣𐰤𐰥𐰦𐰧𐰨𐰩𐰪𐰫𐰬𐰭𐰮𐰯𐰰𐰱𐰲𐰳𐰴𐰵𐰶𐰷𐰸𐰹𐰺𐰻𐰼𐰽𐰾𐰿𐱀𐱁𐱂𐱃𐱄𐱅𐱆𐱇𐱈𐱉𐱊𐱋𐱌𐱍𐱎𐱏𐱐𐱑𐱒𐱓𐱔𐱕𐱖𐱗𐱘𐱙𐱚𐱛𐱜𐱝𐱞𐱟𐱠𐱡𐱢𐱣𐱤𐱥𐱦𐱧𐱨𐱩𐱪𐱫𐱬𐱭𐱮𐱯𐱰𐱱𐱲𐱳𐱴𐱵𐱶𐱷𐱸𐱹𐱺𐱻𐱼𐱽𐱾𐱿𐲀𐲁𐲂𐲃𐲄𐲅𐲆𐲇𐲈𐲉𐲊𐲋𐲌𐲍𐲎𐲏𐲐𐲑𐲒𐲓𐲔𐲕𐲖𐲗𐲘𐲙𐲚𐲛𐲜𐲝𐲞𐲟𐲠𐲡𐲢𐲣𐲤𐲥𐲦𐲧𐲨𐲩𐲪𐲫𐲬𐲭𐲮𐲯𐲰𐲱𐲲𐲳𐲴𐲵𐲶𐲷𐲸𐲹𐲺𐲻𐲼𐲽𐲾𐲿𐳀𐳁𐳂𐳃𐳄𐳅𐳆𐳇𐳈𐳉𐳊𐳋𐳌𐳍𐳎𐳏𐳐𐳑𐳒𐳓𐳔𐳕𐳖𐳗𐳘𐳙𐳚𐳛𐳜𐳝𐳞𐳟𐳠𐳡𐳢𐳣𐳤𐳥𐳦𐳧𐳨𐳩𐳪𐳫𐳬𐳭𐳮𐳯𐳰𐳱𐳲𐳳𐳴𐳵𐳶𐳷𐳸𐳹𐳺𐳻𐳼𐳽𐳾𐳿𐴀𐴁𐴂𐴃𐴄𐴅𐴆𐴇𐴈𐴉𐴊𐴋𐴌𐴍𐴎𐴏𐴐𐴑𐴒𐴓𐴔𐴕𐴖𐴗𐴘𐴙𐴚𐴛𐴜𐴝𐴞𐴟𐴠𐴡𐴢𐴣𐴤𐴥𐴦𐴧𐴨𐴩𐴪𐴫𐴬𐴭𐴮𐴯𐴰𐴱𐴲𐴳𐴴𐴵𐴶𐴷𐴸𐴹𐴺𐴻𐴼𐴽𐴾𐴿𐵀𐵁𐵂𐵃𐵄𐵅𐵆𐵇𐵈𐵉𐵊𐵋𐵌𐵍𐵎𐵏𐵐𐵑𐵒𐵓𐵔𐵕𐵖𐵗𐵘𐵙𐵚𐵛𐵜𐵝𐵞𐵟𐵠𐵡𐵢𐵣𐵤𐵥𐵦𐵧𐵨𐵩𐵪𐵫𐵬𐵭𐵮𐵯𐵰𐵱𐵲𐵳𐵴𐵵𐵶𐵷𐵸𐵹𐵺𐵻𐵼𐵽𐵾𐵿𐶀𐶁𐶂𐶃𐶄𐶅𐶆𐶇𐶈𐶉𐶊𐶋𐶌𐶍𐶎𐶏𐶐𐶑𐶒𐶓𐶔𐶕𐶖𐶗𐶘𐶙𐶚𐶛𐶜𐶝𐶞𐶟𐶠𐶡𐶢𐶣𐶤𐶥𐶦𐶧𐶨𐶩𐶪𐶫𐶬𐶭𐶮𐶯𐶰𐶱𐶲𐶳𐶴𐶵𐶶𐶷𐶸𐶹𐶺𐶻𐶼𐶽𐶾𐶿𐷀𐷁𐷂𐷃𐷄𐷅𐷆𐷇𐷈𐷉𐷊𐷋𐷌𐷍𐷎𐷏𐷐𐷑𐷒𐷓𐷔𐷕𐷖𐷗𐷘𐷙𐷚𐷛𐷜𐷝𐷞𐷟𐷠𐷡𐷢𐷣𐷤𐷥𐷦𐷧𐷨𐷩𐷪𐷫𐷬𐷭𐷮𐷯𐷰𐷱𐷲𐷳𐷴𐷵𐷶𐷷𐷸𐷹𐷺𐷻𐷼𐷽𐷾𐷿𐸀𐸁𐸂𐸃𐸄𐸅𐸆𐸇𐸈𐸉𐸊𐸋𐸌𐸍𐸎𐸏𐸐𐸑𐸒𐸓𐸔𐸕𐸖𐸗𐸘𐸙𐸚𐸛𐸜𐸝𐸞𐸟𐸠𐸡𐸢𐸣𐸤𐸥𐸦𐸧𐸨𐸩𐸪𐸫𐸬𐸭𐸮𐸯𐸰𐸱𐸲𐸳𐸴𐸵𐸶𐸷𐸸𐸹𐸺𐸻𐸼𐸽𐸾𐸿𐹀𐹁𐹂𐹃𐹄𐹅𐹆𐹇𐹈𐹉𐹊𐹋𐹌𐹍𐹎𐹏𐹐𐹑𐹒𐹓𐹔𐹕𐹖𐹗𐹘𐹙𐹚𐹛𐹜𐹝𐹞𐹟𐹠𐹡𐹢𐹣𐹤𐹥𐹦𐹧𐹨𐹩𐹪𐹫𐹬𐹭𐹮𐹯𐹰𐹱𐹲𐹳𐹴𐹵𐹶𐹷𐹸𐹹𐹺𐹻𐹼𐹽𐹾𐹿𐺀𐺁𐺂𐺃𐺄𐺅𐺆𐺇𐺈𐺉𐺊𐺋𐺌𐺍𐺎𐺏𐺐𐺑𐺒𐺓𐺔𐺕𐺖𐺗𐺘𐺙𐺚𐺛𐺜𐺝𐺞𐺟𐺠𐺡𐺢𐺣𐺤𐺥𐺦𐺧𐺨𐺩𐺪𐺫𐺬𐺭𐺮𐺯𐺰𐺱𐺲𐺳𐺴𐺵𐺶𐺷𐺸𐺹𐺺𐺻𐺼𐺽𐺾𐺿𐻀𐻁𐻂𐻃𐻄𐻅𐻆𐻇𐻈𐻉𐻊𐻋𐻌𐻍𐻎𐻏𐻐𐻑𐻒𐻓𐻔𐻕𐻖𐻗𐻘𐻙𐻚𐻛𐻜𐻝𐻞𐻟𐻠𐻡𐻢𐻣𐻤𐻥𐻦𐻧𐻨𐻩𐻪𐻫𐻬𐻭𐻮𐻯𐻰𐻱𐻲𐻳𐻴𐻵𐻶𐻷𐻸𐻹𐻺𐻻𐻼𐻽𐻾𐻿𐼀𐼁𐼂𐼃𐼄𐼅𐼆𐼇𐼈𐼉𐼊𐼋𐼌𐼍𐼎𐼏𐼐𐼑𐼒𐼓𐼔𐼕𐼖𐼗𐼘𐼙𐼚𐼛𐼜𐼝𐼞𐼟𐼠𐼡𐼢𐼣𐼤𐼥𐼦𐼧𐼨𐼩𐼪𐼫𐼬𐼭𐼮𐼯𐼰𐼱𐼲𐼳𐼴𐼵𐼶𐼷𐼸𐼹𐼺𐼻𐼼𐼽𐼾𐼿𐽀𐽁𐽂𐽃𐽄𐽅𐽆𐽇𐽋𐽍𐽎𐽏𐽐𐽈𐽉𐽊𐽌𐽑𐽒𐽓𐽔𐽕𐽖𐽗𐽘𐽙𐽚𐽛𐽜𐽝𐽞𐽟𐽠𐽡𐽢𐽣𐽤𐽥𐽦𐽧𐽨𐽩𐽪𐽫𐽬𐽭𐽮𐽯𐽰𐽱𐽲𐽳𐽴𐽵𐽶𐽷𐽸𐽹𐽺𐽻𐽼𐽽𐽾𐽿𐾀𐾁

Now we know, that the languages of Iran do not admit the Indian compound sv, for which they adopt another, more agreeable to the laws of their sounds. The junction of consonants, originally substituted for sv, is hv, as also h is used for a simple s. This hv, hardened in Zend, becomes kv or q, which simple sound is substituted for the Indian compound sv. The old Persian language, less hard in sound, softens the above mentioned hv in such a way, as to lose the h in u, so nearly related to v; the junction of characters, which corresponds in the arrow-headed writing to the Zend 𐬑, properly denotes therefore uv.* This alteration is foreign to the Indian Prâcrit.

According to my opinion, the k in the name, above mentioned, represents, as the Zendic q does, the compound sv, which is included in the Greek letters $\sigma\pi$. Sva might be expressed in Greek by $\sigma\upsilon\alpha$. But by supposing, that v was more hardly pronounced, (as for example the γ of Sanscrit indeed becomes κ in Zend), we shall not find the orthography $\sigma\pi$ for sv very strange. And I shall not insist even upon maintaining, that those kings were called Svalyrios and Svalirisos; but I use only sv to explain, how k (equivalent to) 𐬑 may represent sp; This k is the third Iranian transformation of hv, in the process of which h becomes hard, as in Zend, but entirely drops the sound v, consequently sv in Sanscrit, hv, or q in Zend, uv in ancient Persian, k in the language of the coins, not yet geographically defined, (as to the countries in which it prevailed.)

But why then a double kind of pronunciation upon the same coin? If the name of the king was *Kalirisos* in the native language, why was it not the same in Greek? and how could it be written *Spalirisus* in Greek, if it in fact did not sound thus in the language of the country? A third view is still possible, which appears to settle the difficulty. The king, not being a native, was probably called *Spalirisus* or *Sualirisos* in his own language, but not in the language of the country, whose inhabitants were under his sway. They changed the name into *Kalirisos*, according to the system of their sounds, while the coin-stampers, knowing the Greek language, had no reason to call him otherwise than he did himself.

* The old Persian arrow-headed inscriptions, p. 107.

of the foregoing king, the mark of the vowel e is so often omitted, that we need not scruple at supplying ¶, as a vestige of it is almost extant upon one coin. But if the first two syllables are *kali*, the third must be ¶. For this the only distinct specimen has a character which we may take for r, to the head of whose angle a small circle is annexed. But then follows a sign which we may read as t, d, or r, and hence we are not allowed to take the preceding sign as r. The same φ, however, denotes a Greek v upon the latest coins of this class. The most probable conjecture therefore would be to supply e with regard to the fourth character, and so far it would be read, *kalyri*. But now, according to the precedent of the previous names, there must follow ¶Λ, jô, viz. Kalyrijô, instead of which we meet with a character which is merely to be read as an m. The fact, however, that ¶ follows υ, is of main importance, as this being the case, the word is complete.

According to the specimens lying before me, this ¶ is not certain, and the entire reading is therefore left problematical.

Mô does by no means compensate for the expected jô; on the other hand the Greek writing in no sort authorises us to read OY instead of MOY. I cannot unravel this difficulty. Mr. Prinsep presumed, the word which I take for the name, to be the translation of *brother*, and supposed, that the word *king* was at the end of the legend. Against this supposition I have to raise the decisive objection, that the name cannot be expressed by the first word, and that, on the contrary, we can point it out on the most plausible conjecture in the third word. This being the case, the construction differs from the Greek,* and the *brother of the king*, or what corresponds to this word, occupies the first place; the legend, as far as I have observed, never commences upon these coins from below, in consequence, we have not to look for another word, preceding the first. Nevertheless it is possible, that the third word was followed by a title for *Spalyrios*, though there is left no room for a legend below, if the coins are exactly represented.

The first word seems to have been so well and congruously

* Mr. James Prinsep reads the Bactrian legend of the coins of Undopherras פרזאפרזן Farahetasa Nandatasa, which seems a preferable reading to this of Mr. Lassen,---H. T. P.

preserved, as not to admit any alteration of the letters. We dare only speculate, as to whether it have six or seven characters, and as room is left for the first (?) according to my previous remark, we may presume, that Mr. Masson was mistaken with reference to this letter. The word is therefore פתתללל. This, however, is a complete mystery to me; neither do I know a word, which denotes *brother* or relation of any degree, bearing the least similarity to this, nor can I derive a proper signification from those syllables, though the end (*paró? pádó?*) exhibits a common Indian word. I must therefore leave this word to an inquirer who is more fortunate in guessing, or more acute in discerning.

Another barbarian king was named *Ynadpherres** or *Yndopherres†* (Undopherres) and styled himself βασιλέως σωτήρος or βασιλείς σωτήρ; for the Greek legend gradually exhibits the nominative, which the native language used from the beginning, As. Trans. Vol. IV. Pl. XXIV. No. 5—8. The legends, which are much spoiled, supply each other's deficiencies as follow; I remark, that the name is to be read from within the inside, and not in the manner in which we usually read coins, by keeping the image on them in its natural position; this will be easily evident, if the letters are looked at in the usual way—

No. 5	gives	פףףף פלללל	----
” 6	”	----פ פלללל פ	
” 7	”	פפ----	---לל פללל
” 8	”	פףףף	

* Mr. James Prinsep explains this, by discovering the word *Pātasa* after *Balahara* or *Svalahara*, and the difficulty does appear to be removed by this reading, which is quite reconcilable with the idiom of the language.—H. T. P.

† There is only one letter preceding N, namely Y. Mr. Mionnet reads likewise YNADΦEPPOY, and adds a *Sic?* Description de médailles antiques supplément, Tome VIII. p. 506. I only got this work, while printing my book. I am sorry to add, that the reading of the native legends is not only not advanced by the representations there exhibited, but the legends, which we may read without difficulty in the representations of them, given by Messrs. Raoul-Rochette and Prinsep, are perverted in an indistinct web of confused strokes. The false classification might be passed over, as it would not cause great impediment to inquiry, but I have taken sufficient pains with this work, to dare to assert, that to try to decipher anything with certainty from those copies would be labour in vain.

I have already before discussed the orthography of *dhādhāró*, here it differs only in that it is placed before the word *king*.

By comparing the four specimens, we observe, that the name consists only of five native characters, and also that it ends in *ô*. The first letter *ϕ* of the word cannot be but a vowel in its initial form, and according to the course of the language, in other instances, we should have to adopt an *e* for *v*. As, however, the letter *ɳ* in the name Eukratides was fixed for this, the sense of both letters becomes doubtful; for *ϕ* being *e*, *ɳ* would be *u*, and *vice versâ*. I would rather adopt *y* for *ϕ*, keeping the signification *e* for *ɳ*; for we found above *ϕ* must be a vowel, which we know cannot be *e*, as *e* is never written in the line, while in the Greek the equivalent was *v*. The symbol *ϕ* often occurs in the legends of Manikyâla, and is certainly genuine. No. 22.

Between *y* and *ô* there are merely three letters for the three consonants *d-ph-r*, commencing the syllables, which we ought to admit, if the name was *Yndopherres*; in this case the *n*, preceding *d*, is dropped according to the rule. Also the second symbol is a real *d* upon one specimen; upon the second is a character, which appears indeed to be corrupt, but a corruption rather of *n* than *d*. If *Ynadpherres* be considered as the name, though the language of the coins would absorb *d* into *ph*, yet it would not express by any legible mark the *d*, so absorbed. We are here also left in the dark; but as *d* is much more certain than *n*, I shall at once decide in favour of *d*. Therefore *yda* stands for the first half. Then follows *ʎ*; *ε* being expressed by *e*, we must consider it as denoting *phi*; but we above found *p* for *ϕ* in *Philoxenos*, and shall do the same in *Kadphises*. The tolerably distinct coin of *Kadphises* has, however, (*As. Trans. Vol. iv. Pl. xxxviii. No. 3*, as with *Tod. Pl. xii. No. 10*), the form *ϙ* for *pi*; here the little cross line is perhaps meant to give the force to *p* as *f*. Our *ʎ* is entirely different from it; what might be taken for the mark of a vowel, is no *e*, and could at the most be *u*; this will not advance us a step further. On the other hand *ʎ* has a great similarity with the initial letter of *Eukratides*, and as *ê* is probably written in the line, according to the analogy of *ô*, we might read here

was to be read without any flexion, as other coins exhibit *Καδαφες*. The less reason is there then to connect *mo*, which has no flexion, with Kadphises. It is evident, that much is here left to be explained, but chiefly the word which has been proved superfluous, whether it be in the middle or on the end. We shall likewise mention the two symbols *ϣ* and *ϣ*, No. 23 and 24, as wanting confirmation.

The most ancient coins, on which appear the characters hitherto discussed, come down to about the year 180—160. B. C. The kings Yndopherres and Kadphises probably reigned in the first century A. C. A variety of the same characters, more like italic characters, but not essentially differing, is met with among relics in Manikyâla, where are discovered likewise coins of the Sassanides; traces of these characters are even to be observed upon the coins of the Sassanides themselves; we can therefore assign to this alphabet a period from the year 160 B. C. at least to the year 226. A. C., a period therefore of four hundred years. From Menandros and Eukratides to Yndopherres this difference alone is remarkable, that the characters of the native alphabet continue to be well formed and regular, while the Greek deteriorate more and more to a barbarian level. The italic letters out of the topes probably exhibit, rather the running hand in daily use, while the characters upon the coins represent the monumental form.

This remark may serve to introduce a variety of the writing upon the coins, of a peculiar spiral form, which we have no reason for assigning to a later period than to that of Kadphises, and which would therefore appear to be a provincial deviation from it.

§ 6.

Variety of the characters of coins upon some coins of Hermaios.

I here bring together another class of coins, not yet very numerous, which, like the preceding, present upon the one side Greek, upon the other side native legends in a peculiar form of the alphabet, to which, however, Mr. Prinsep has already drawn our attention. *As. Trans.* iv. p. 347. Besides the Greek has become much more rough, and we do not know, if we meet with barbarian words, or with Greek ones in the dis-

figuration, effected by barbarian ignorance ; the native characters appear at the first glance quite foreign to us.

We will first compare two coins, *As. Trans.* Vol. v. Pl. xxxv. No. 12, and Vol. iv. Pl. xxiv. No. 11. The one has the Greek legend, ΚΑΔΦΙΖΟ ΧΟΡΓ --- ΚΟΖΟΥΛΟ, and supplies the other, where we find, ΚΑΔΦΙCΕC ----- ΝΟ, as it seems for, ΚΑΔΦΙΣΕΣ ΚΟΖΟΥΛΟΧΟΡΑΝΟ ; for here is O generally a square, and C for Σ.

The native legend has :

𑀓𑀲𑀭𑀮 - - - - 𑀅𑀲𑀭𑀮𑀲𑀭𑀮
𑀓𑀲𑀭𑀮𑀮 - - - - 𑀅𑀲𑀭𑀮𑀲𑀭𑀮

iv. Pl. xxiv. No. 13 is not certain.

We are astonished at recognising in the first two signs after the cross, which recurs often upon these coins, and scarcely has the value of a letter, the last letters in the foregoing Kadphises legend, represented according to Mr. Prinsep. We may read them *nara (man)*. The letters, subsequent to this, are evidently in the common character of the coins 𑀅𑀲𑀭, save, that here a round tail is substituted for the small cross line below, as the characters are generally altered from an angular to a rounder form. We find consequently *Kagala*, or if we read according to the Greek, the inherent *a* by *o*, as it is now also read in Bengalee, *Kogolo*, we have therefore here the un-Grecian word, which already occurred in the Greek writing.

If we turn to the last word, the initial letter of it is *y*, the two last syllables are *vama* or *vomo*. Though we might take the second letter for 𑀲, according to one coin, yet the others, belonging to this class, have always a character similar to 𑀲, and the word consequently is *yhovomo*, which obviously is the word 𑀲𑀲𑀲𑀲𑀲 upon the coins of Kadphises ; 𑀲 therefore is *u*, and we accordingly must infer, that the name in the foregoing legends had existed in the unoccupied space (of the legend).

Let us place these coins in comparison with all those, the relics of whose Greek legends are as follows : *As. Trans.* Vol. iv. Pl. xxiv. No. 9, 10, 12, v. Pl. xxxv. No. 10, - - ΛΕΩΣ ΣΤΗΡΟΣΣΥΛ□ - ΒΑΣΙΛΕ - - - - ΕΡΜ - ΒΑΣΙΛΕΩΣ - - - Ε□Υ, - and ΒΑΣΙΛΕΩΣ ΣΤΗΡΟΣΣΥ ΕΡΜΑΙΟΥ.

We have here an entirely foreign word ΣΤΗΡΟΣ. If this,

conjecture, entirely ungrounded, as we cannot at all explain the following; not even the name of Hermaios is to be discovered, and we should probably find extant the name of his Scythian conqueror, together with what corresponds to the strange, ΣΥ.

Notwithstanding this obscurity, we may, however, derive some isolated facts from these coins; first, that the language is here no longer Indian. Thus *Uhavima* and *Kagala* do not admit of a natural and appropriate interpretation as Indian words. Both of them perhaps belonged to the Scythian language, and it appears cannot be explained, but with reference to the context. KOPANO agrees with the Indian dialect upon the Kanerkes-coins, which have PAO in place of the former Râjô; we cannot therefore allow of Κόρανος. Nor can it denote *king* or *prince*, used as it is in immediate connection with PAO, king. Therefore upon the Kadphises-coins, where XOPANO appears in juxta-position with KOZOYΛO, the title of *king*, must be looked for, being probably KOZOYΛO, *king*. As these Hermaios-coins have the word βασιλέως, and give στῆρος as a Greek word, viz. for σωτήρος, we must expect to meet with an equivalent for *deliverer* upon them; the plausible inference suggests itself, that *Uhavima* upon the reverse may be the Scythian word for σωτήρ.

To this interpretation it may be objected, that *Uhavima*, being the same with Οσημο in the great Kadphises legends, is observed to follow σωτήρ, and that consequently it cannot be the same term, but rather some native epithet of the Kadphises.

To this division belongs a third variety of Kadphises-coins, upon which ΖΑΘΟΥ is substituted for KOZOYΛO; this also is a term for *king*, probably not of Scythian origin; for it occurs As. Trans. Vol. v. Plate xxxv. p. 553: XOPANOY ΖΑΘΟΥ ΚΑΔΑΦΕΣ.

I shall not undertake reading the native legend from the edited specimen, especially as Mr. Prinsep has promised to put together some other coins of this class.

KOPANOY and ΖΑΘΟΥ are declined as Greek words, unless ΟΥ be not taken for a varied orthography of Ο: the barbarian name *Kadaphes*, on the other hand, is not declined.

Zaθov calls to mind as well the Sanscrit *Kshattr* (man of the military caste) as *Khshathra*, the Zend word for *king*; the *r* in this case would have been absorbed on account of the softer dialect, while *z* was used for *khsh* (X) or rather for a softer pronunciation, perhaps *sh* as in *Pilushino* for Philoxenos. This interpretation being ascertained, we make the attempt at explaining also in the same dialects the word KOPANO, or XOPANO. *Kirana* (ray quasi, radiant) finally adopted by Mr. Prinsep, is not at all satisfactory, any more than *Karana* (to do) but *Karana* also denotes man of impure caste, son of an impure Kshatrija couple, or according to the opinion of others, son of a Vaishcha by a Soodra woman, whose occupation is the profession of a writer. By this interpretation we should have got two titles from Indian castes. But I am prevented from acceding to it by the fact, that XOPANO occurs with ΖΑΘΟΥ, and that the combination of the different titles of this class of coins leads to σωτήρ, as representing the word KOPANO; for the title *deliverer* is adhered to with such predilection by those Scythians, that we may ordinarily expect this meaning, and as ΖΑΘΟΥ for *king* probably refers to a dialect, nearer related to Zend, I would rather look for an interpretation to that language. Here, however, it appears, it is not to be discovered; for though *qarena* is a word in Zend, the signification (*brilliant*) is not a proper one. The following, however, also speaks in favour of Zend. By the title KOPANO a tie is formed between the Kanerkes-coins, and those of the family of Kadphises, for both of them are thus styled. But then the other words upon the Kanerkes-coins refer to a dialect, which indeed also contains reference to India, but at the same time points at certain elements, more congenial to Iran.

While this class of coins, partly by the name *Hermaios*, partly by the title σωτήρ, and by the combination of Greek and native legends, is linked together with the expiration of Greek dominion, it is also connected by the word KOPANO with the class of Kanerki coins of partly Scythian origin, the words of which, though not of the Greek language, are always written in Greek characters. The terms *Zaθov* and *Koζουλο*

as well as the form of characters, somewhat altered, are peculiar to it, whilst other coins with the name *Kadphises* present the characters, previously used. The real *Kadphises* coins have all symbols of worship of Siva, and the word *oonpo*, *Uhavima*, the *Karano-Kadaphes*, a Hercules.

To comprehend all the palæographic and philological facts, referring to our investigation, we must, before entering upon the attempt at applying these coins to history, at least touch on some other relics of this writing.

§ 7.

The legends in the Topes.

In the digging of the *Topes*, (*stooas*), which are so frequently discovered throughout the whole region, governed by the Indo-Scythian kings, and which were most probably destined for their ashes, some inscriptions are found in the same characters we have hitherto discussed, in a more running hand, however, and difficult to be read with accuracy. They are published by Mr. Prinsep, and I may refer to his accounts of them.* These inscriptions being important in more than one respect to our investigations, we should have made the attempt at their interpretation, if we could have done it, without departing too much from the subject, peculiar to this work.

But this departure would have been necessary, for the writing is more indistinct than that upon the coins, especially so the characters of the inscription, most ample and apparently most important. Though engaging therefore in tedious grammatical discussions, yet many things must have been left partly without any explanation, and partly under a mere doubtful interpretation, and from the decyphering, but partially successful, no profitable conclusion would have resulted, as respects the historical arrangement of the Indo-Scythian kings. Lastly, it would also have been necessary to have entered upon a consideration of the end, for which these remarkable architectural monuments themselves were constructed, and to have examined the views, which a celebrated German scholar has pronounced concerning them. The *topes*

* As. Trans. III. Pl. XXI. and Pl. XXXIII. It must be attributed to the inexperience of these characters at that time, that the inscriptions are reversed.

are much better adapted to a separate treatise, which may be published in time.

Here we shall merely call in question the view under which these monuments are deemed Buddhist. Buddhistic coins, exhibiting on the obverse the old Indian characters which occur on the columns of Asoka, and on the reverse those characters we are here illustrating, have been indeed discovered in India, but never in the topes. Hence appears it very surprising, that Buddhist kings should have had buried with them, various coins of the Romans, of the Sassanides, of the worshippers of Mithra, and even such as allude to the worship of Shiva and Vishnoo, excluding entirely (their own or) Buddhist coins.

We shall take from these inscriptions only what is confirmed beyond doubt. They first prove, that the native characters, adopted upon the coins by the Græco-Indian kings, out of regard to their subjects, were not only retained under the government of the first Indo-Scythian, but also continued to the period of the Sassanides; for in the topes Sassanian coins, furnished with Pehlvi, and Deva Nagaree legends, are discovered among the coins of Kadphises, and Kanerki. The characters of our coins therefore were still in use under the Sassanides, even after the time when the Kanerkes dynasty had abolished the use of the characters upon the coins in their empire.

The inscriptions, moreover, bear witness to the writing being used for other purposes than for inscriptions on coins; probably, however, by kings only of foreign descent, and who reigned on the borders of India. On this hereafter.

Lastly, with regard to the language; as the termination ô frequently recurs, and the word *Mahârájô** was discovered by Mr. Prinsep in the larger inscription of Manikyâla, evidence is afforded, that we fall in here also with the Indian language; the inscription at Jellalabad contains purely Indian words in Prâcrit.

Upon monuments of a later period than that of the Sassanides, no traces of the characters upon our coins have yet appeared.

* As Trans. III. pl. xxxiii. second line, iv. p. 336.

§ 8.

Coins of Agathokles and Pantaleon.

We may now turn to another class of coins, those namely of the kings, above mentioned. The coins of both of them have genuine Greek characters, and those of Agathokles must be numbered with the most beautiful coins, which have been preserved, and belong to the most flourishing period of Greek art in Bactria, and the countries adjacent. Both kings hold to the simple title βασιλέως, but have besides upon the reverse of some coins, legends in the most ancient shape of Indian characters, of the very same shape which is discovered in Prâcrit upon the laths, thus styled, or columns with Buddhistic inscriptions in Prâcrit.

The merit of having decyphered these most ancient Indian characters, is also due to Mr. Prinsep, and I have here only to give an account of the manner he has applied them to these coins.*

The Agathokles coins (R. R. I. No. 1, As. Trans. III. Pl. IX. No. 17. v. Pl. xxxv. No. 9) present the following signs :

𑀘𑀓𑀭𑀺𑀲𑀺𑀓𑀲𑀺𑀓 The penultimate alone is indistinct; Mr. Prinsep presumes it to be 𑀲, therefore *Agathuklajég*, which he takes for the Greek genitive 'Αγαθοκλεους; I should rather prefer 𑀲, or *jog*. Still it appears strange to meet here with a Greek rather than a native form for the Greek. That the Greek 𑀓 should be expressed by 𑀲, or *j* may be explained by suggesting, that the final 𑀓 was received as a media (sound) like the *z* in *Zend*, to which *j* would be the most appropriate Indian letter. These coins had another word over the female Bacchanal, of which no undisputed characters have been preserved; it is perhaps, as Mr. Prinsep supposes, a fragment of *rája*.

In the name we observe also a mode of representing vowels purely Indian, viz. *a*, not expressed by a sign, and *u*, annexed below to the consonant, as also the ligature *ke*, which is completely Indian.

Of Pantaleon have only been discovered coins with legends, likewise in the same Sanscrit characters, As. Trans. vol v. Pl. xxxv. No. 8, III. Pl. IX. No. 18, excepting the first letter, the name

* As. Trans. VI. p. 465.

is preserved: 𑀧𑀭𑀯𑀭𑀮 Pantalavanta; the termination is wanting, and what Mr. Prinsep has supplied for it, *tâ*, appears to me unsatisfactory. Here, as with Agathokles, the hiatus in *εov* and *εο* is amended by the insertions of a semivowel, in the latter *j*, and here *v*, as above, in the names *Dijamidô*, *Lisijô*. Besides, the use of the Anusvâra must be noticed, as representative of nasal sound. Upon the Pantaleon-coins, moreover, are only illegible fragments of the title; but two of these symbols lead to *râja*, preceded by something else, which perhaps formed originally *mahâdrâjô*, “the supreme king.” To the historical illustration of these coins, the only ones upon which Greek and purely Indian characters are put together, we shall afterwards return.

§ 9.

The Kanerkes Coins.

Lastly, come we to a very numerous class of Indo-Scythian coins, having only Greek characters, which seldom represent Greek words, but ordinarily give in Greek letters, either un-Grecian regal titles, or names of gods. They are of very different types; on the obverse, either a standing male figure in the dress of a Tartar, or a bust only; or else one mounted on an elephant; or, lastly, a figure, resting on a couch, with the legs crossed one over the other, after the fashion of the East, the head surrounded by a glory. The legend sometimes ΒΑΣΙΛΕΥΣ, sometimes ΒΑΣΙΛΕΥΣ ΒΑΣΙΛΕΩΝΚΑΝΕΡΚΟΥ, or ΠΑΟΝΑΝΟ ΠΑΟ ΚΑΝΗΡΚΙ ΚΟΠΑΝΟ or ΠΑΟ-ΚΑΝΗΡΚΙ, upon those with the bust ΠΑΟΝΑΝΟ ΠΑΟ ΟΗΡΚΙ (ΟΟΗΡΚΙ or ΧΙ) ΚΟΠΑΝΟ; upon the others the same titles, with an illegible name. The reverses have various figures of gods, together with their names in Greek characters, but seldom in the Greek language, but commonly in a native one.

This result, which I have taken from Mr. Prinsep’s laborious investigations, may suffice for the present purpose; I also refer to him for the fact, (As. Trans. iv. p. 630) that the coins never present legends in native characters.

I call the king *Kanerki*, because he so styles himself, when he assumes native titles. The form *Κανηρκου* appears to have ari-

sen from the mere misunderstanding of the Scythian die-founders. Observing upon the former coins ordinarily the Greek genitive in *ov*, on the reverse in the native language the nominative in *ô*, which did not sound very differently, they overlooked the different application. *Κανηρκου* therefore appeared to them the proper form, to be placed by the Greek titles, even when the use of the nominative was then adopted for the Greek legend. Thus is *Κανηρκου* put by *βασιλεὺς*; though *Kanerko* could be only properly used, when accompanied by *Mahārāja*.

I have already previously professed my ignorance concerning *KOPANO*; it is singular, that *σωτήρ*, according to our conjecture, corresponding to that word, never occurs, to my knowledge, with the word *βασιλεὺς* upon these coins.

Rao Nano Rao is certainly properly explained by Mr. Prinsep to be the same with *βασιλεὺς βασιλέων*; I add the following remarks on the forms. *Rao* (viz. *raô*) points to a dialectic difference, a step more distant from the original form, than is the form *rajô* of the other coins; for in the first place the consonant *j* is dropped, a proceeding indeed often resorted to in the learned Prâcrit; but whenever *râa* and *râjâ* are found together in the ordinary spoken language, the difference in form, refers to a difference in dialect. To the historic grammarian *raâ* is a later form than *râjâ*; however, it need have therefore arisen at a later period; for one dialect may have anticipated the rest in the reduction of the old forms; we may, or may not, therefore, refer dialectically *rao* to another province. Again, the declination of *rao* is not as the simple word *râjan* would require it should be, according to Sanscrit rule; but, on the other hand, the compound word *maharajah* is most properly brought under the declination in *a*; but as we do not know any instance of the simple word *râjan*, the parallel has no application.

Rao Nano can merely be the genitive plural. In Prâcrit it would be *rannam*, or after the declination in *a* *râ(j)â nam*. Instead of this, *Nano* seems to be the termination upon the coins in question, and this termination is not joined to *râa*, as to the root of the word, but to the nominative *rao*, and the *m* of the termination is changed into *no*. If I take a right view of the form *raonano*, it belongs to the period of transition, when from the

first degree of the decomposition of grammatical structure of the Sanscrit, evidence of which is exhibited to us in Prâcrit, the language was about to retrograde another step ; thus, not distinctly comprehending the sense of the old form, the language then in use could no longer distinguish the peculiar form of the root from that of the termination.

The name *Kanerki* has been compared with *Kanishka*, which occurs in the chronicle of Caschmir, and in the traditions of the Buddhists. I would not scruple at the r, as supplied by sh, and if the comparison of them was well founded, I would even proceed a step further, and find in *Οηρκι* the same *Hushka*, who is mentioned with *Kanishka*. On the supposition, that *Οηρκι* might stand for *Huirki*, and sh substituted for r, we could easily fancy *Huishka* to be altered into *Hushka*. But besides the difficulties in chronology, which I have not to enter upon at present, another reason from the coins themselves is opposed to our recognizing *Hushka* and *Kanishka* in *Οηρκι* and *Κανηρκι*. Both of them are described as Buddhist ; upon the coins of these latter, however, a worship, entirely deviating from that of the Buddhists, is distinctly obvious.

For these coins present on their reverse figures of gods, as to which, on a reference to the various religious systems, prevailing for the first centuries of our era in central Asia, we fortunately can be but rarely in doubt. The names occur with them, and in part quite legible. I may here refer to the explanation, most successfully given by K. O. Mueller,* on the system of gods, represented upon the *Kanerki*-coins. According to him, it is a system of typified gods, originating in the pure worship of Zoroaster's doctrine of light, which readily adopted the elements of the worship of Nature, prevailing in Asia Minor at that period, while it at the same time communicated to all the objects of worship, so adopted, the general stamp of *gods of light*.

* Goett. Gel. Anz. 1838, 237, p. 233.

(To be continued.)